

REMARKS

Claims 7 and 9-11 are pending in this application. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Interview

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Cohen at the interview held June 24, 2009, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,083,868 to Yoshida et al. (herein "Yoshida"), U.S. Patent 5,346,875 to Wachter et al. (herein "Wachter"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,753,581 to Beckmeyer et al. (herein "Beckmeyer").¹ Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The applied references fail to teach or suggest, or establish any reason or rationale to provide a process comprising:

preparing a solution containing a ceria sol and a sol of at least either one of alumina and silica, wherein the isoelectric point of the ceria sol differs more than 3.5 from that of said at least one of alumina and silica sol,

adjusting the pH of said solution to be closer to the isoelectric point of the sol of at least either one of alumina and silica than to the isoelectric point of the ceria sol, and to fall within and ± 2.0 of the isoelectric point of alumina and/or silica sol, and

aggregating the sol from said solution to produce an aggregate

as required by claim 7 (emphasis added).

¹ U.S. Patent No. 5,492,870 to Wilcox et al. ("Wilcox") is mentioned in the detailed action at pages 4 and 5 but appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the text of the rejection.

The Office Action, at page 3, acknowledges that Yoshida does not teach a method of making a catalyst involving the isoelectric points of each compound, but asserts that Wachter cures this deficiency. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Wachter, at column 2, line 58 to column 3, line 6, discloses a method for manufacturing a catalytic cracking catalyst that includes (emphasis added):

- (1) providing components of a framework structure;
- (2) providing an inorganic oxide sol, such as a silica or alumina sol;
- (3) measuring the isoelectric points of the components of the framework structure;
- (4) measuring the pH of the inorganic oxide sol;
- (5) matching the isoelectric point of each component of the framework structure to the pH of the inorganic oxide sol; then
- (6) combining the components of the framework structure and the inorganic oxide sol in solution; and
- (7) drying the combined suspension.

Clearly, Wachter discloses that the components have their isoelectric points matched before they are combined in solution and, thus, the solution prepared in step 6 of Wachter fails to have sols with isoelectric points that differ by more than 3.5. Therefore, as acknowledged during the interview, Wachter does not cure the deficiencies of Yoshida with respect to claim 7.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, the applied references fail to disclose "preparing a solution containing a ceria sol and a sol of at least either one of alumina and silica, wherein the isoelectric point of the ceria sol differs more than 3.5 from that of said at least one of alumina and silica sol," as required by claim 7, much less disclose, or establish any reason or rationale to provide, a step for adjusting the pH of such a solution to be "closer to the isoelectric point of the sol of at least either one of alumina and silica," which is also required by claim 7 (emphasis added). Beckmeyer and Wilcox merely disclose various isoelectric points and properties of compounds such as ceria, alumina, and silica and, thus, fail to cure the above deficiencies of Yoshida and Wachter.

Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, the applied references fail to teach or suggest, or establish any reason or rationale to provide, the combination of features recited in claim 7 and thus would not have rendered obvious claim 7.

Claim 7 would not have been rendered obvious by the applied references.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 7 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by the applied references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Benjamin S. Prebyl
Registration No. 60,256

JAO:BSP

Date: June 30, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
